QUALITY ASSURANCE HYDRO CHECKLIST FOR BRIDGE AND BRIDGE-SIZED CULVERT

FOR R/W PLANS REVIEW

Tidal follows riverine criteria except when specifically noted

Updated 9/15/2021

QA Item	Check	hov		Reference
Closed Stormwater Drainage	CHECK	.DUX		Reference
Proper application of approved inlet type	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	719-000 Standard Drawings
Drainage structures placed at appropriate locations to				, 15 000 000110010 2101111160
adequately drain system	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	
Cross-section of drainage system pipes shown in roadway cross-			<u>.</u>	
sections	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Instructional Bulletin 2009-5
Min 18" pipe except for yard drains and driveway pipes	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 2.2.6
Pipes arranged in a hydraulically and economically efficient			•	
manner	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	
Sideline Ditches				
Sideline ditches fall within designated R/W (backslope can be	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	
covered by permission)	□162		⊔N/A	
Positive drainage maintained	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	
Sideline ditches continuous all the way to an outfall ditch or to	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Clean Water Act - Section 404
start of wetlands area	□ 1 C 3			Clean Water Act - Section 404
Outfall Ditches				
Outfall ditch profile and cross-section shown in plans	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 2.2.12 & 2.2.12.2
Outfall ditches maintain positive drainage	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 2.2.12 & 2.2.12.2
Outfalls that are natural watercourses left undisturbed where	¬Voo	- No	-NI/A	RHDS - Section 2.2.12.2;
possible	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Engineering Directive 27 -
				Drainage Outfalls
Cross-lines				
<u>cross mics</u>				RCP - Std Dwg 714-205-02 - Table
				714-205B; SRAP - Std Dwg 714-
				605-02 - Table 714-605B; HDPE -
Fill height requirements met	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Std Dwg 714-705-02 - Table 714-
				705B; Instructional Bulletin 2010-
				01
Cross-lines labeled in roadway cross-sections	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Instructional Bulletin 2009-5
Cross-lines less than 10% grade	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Concrete Pipe Design Manual
Beveled end section used on cross-lines for primary routes	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Plan Preparation Guide - Chapter 9
beveiled end section disea on cross lines for primary routes				
Ensure adequate R/W for installation of ends treatment	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Section 804-205-00
Stormwater Management				DUDC 045 205 04 th 1 045
Ensure adequate R/W for Stormwater Management ponds and	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 815-305-01 through 815-
sediment basins				305-07
Sediment & Erosion Control		_		
Ensure adequate R/W for installation of silt fence	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Std Dwg 815-605-00
Ensure adequate R/W for installation of sediment dams	□Yes		□N/A	Std Dwg 815-405-01
Ensure adequate R/W for installation of other BMP's	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Section 815-000 Std Dwg's
Ensure adequate R/W for pipe outlet rip-rap pads	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Sections 804-000 to 310
The same of the sa				221112112 02 1 000 10 020
<u>Bridge</u>				
Ensure adequate R/W to encompass proposed bridge on new		_ 81	-NI/A	
alignment	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	
Proposed bridge span the channel and provides room for	□\/ o o		¬N1/A	UDP 2010 4 1 1 10 22 4 1 1 11
abutment, pier, and pile setback criteria	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.10 and 1.1.11

QUALITY ASSURANCE HYDRO CHECKLIST FOR BRIDGE AND BRIDGE-SIZED CULVERT

FOR CONSTRUCTION PLANS REVIEW

Tidal follows riverine criteria except when specifically noted

Updated 9/15/2021

QA Item	Check Box			Reference
Computer Models				
Acceptable numerical models used for Hydrology and	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS p. 74
Hydraulics			•	•
List computer models used:				
Hydrologic Analysis				
Discharges calculated for the 50,10,4,2,1, and 0.2 % AEP (2, 10,	Vo.s	- No	¬N./Λ	DUDC 1 2 1 1 C
25, 50, 100, and 500-year storm events)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.1 C
Discharges determined using USGS regression equations (most common)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.1 C
Discharges determined using Log-Pearson Type III frequency	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.1 C
distribution for gaged streams Hydrograph routing for drainage areas with significant storage				
volume	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.1 C
Other method for determining discharges (explanation	□Vos	□ No	□NI/Λ	DUDC 1 2 1 1 C
required)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.1 C
□Explanation				
Hydraulic Modeling				
Hydraulic analysis performed using appropriate 1D or 2D	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
method for modeling				111130 110.11 otep 1 3
Hydraulic model contains existing, natural, and proposed conditions runs	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
50,10,4,2,1, and 0.2 % AEP (2, 10, 25, 50, 100, and 500-year	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
storm event) discharges are modeled for each condition				111130 110.11 otep 1 3
Hydraulic model geometry developed from survey data, LiDAR,	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
and/or USGS topo maps Hydraulic model contains sensitivity analysis to ensure study is				
modeled downstream far enough to where a +- 3 ft starting				
water surface elevation does not affect water surface elevation	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
at proposed bridge site				
Hydraulic model extends upstream far enough to where no	Vo.s	□ No	-N/A	DUDC 1 2 1 Cton 2 D
backwater is caused by the proposed bridge	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 B
Compliance to FEMA and SCDOT guidelines have been met				
when modeling bridges and culverts within limits of Flood	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 C
Insurance Studies 1. D. model follow HEC BAS Hydraulic Peferance Manual				
1-D model follow HEC-RAS <i>Hydraulic Reference Manual</i> guidelines	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 C
2-D models follow <i>Two Dimensional Hydraulic Modeling for</i>				
Highways in the River Environment guidance and others	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 C
mentioned in RHDS section				·
Appropriate Manning's "n" values used in model	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 2 A 2
Bridge Geometric Layout				
	_V:	_ 1	-51/2	HDB 2019-4 1.1.9;**Design
Low chord of replacement bridge not below existing bridge	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	Variance**
Bridge ends of replacement bridge not within limits of existing	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.9;**Design
bridge			•	Variance**

Abutment toes of replacement bridge do not extend past abutment toe of existing bridge	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.9;**Design Variance**
Orientation of bridge substructure determined by high flow angle	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 8
Spacing of overflow bridges does not exceed 1/2 mile in wide floodplains	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 8
Min low chord set based on hydraulic design criteria. Check freeboard requirements. Roadway and structural requirements may dictate higher grade than hydraulic requirements.	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1 Step 8
Fully span channels when practical	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.11
Min distance from top of channel bank for abutment setback met. Abutment toe placed 10 ft from top of bank, or at a point where the projection of the spill through slope provides a minimum 10 ft distance from any point on the channel bank or bed, whichever distance is greater	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.10 - Figure 1.3; **Design Variance**
Min distance from top of channel bank for substructure setback met. Minimum set back for piles = 5 ft setback; Pier widths <= 5ft = 10 ft setback; Pier width > 5 ft = 10 ft setback plus half the pier width beyond 5 ft		□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.11 - Figure 1.4, 1.5 and Table 1.2
Bents and piers aligned to existing structure for parallel bridges	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.3.1.8 Step 8 C
Piers are located away from bank toes	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HEC 9 and HEC 18
Piers are not located near the thalweg	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HEC 9 and HEC 18
Hydraulic Model Design Criteria				
1 % AEP (100-yr event) flood does not overtop roadway	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.1; **Design Variance**
Backwater < 1.0 ft for 1 % AEP (100-yr event) compared to natural conditions	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.1; **Design Variance**
Proposed bridge backwater ≤ existing bridge backwater	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.1; **Design Variance**
Design flood frequency correct for road type □4 % AEP (25-year event) for secondary routes □2 % AEP (50-year event) for Interstate, Primary, and Evacuation Routes	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.1
Min freeboard requirements met for design flood	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.5; **Design Variance**
□Rivers - min 2.0 ft □Large rivers - min 7.0 ft □Lakes - min 8.0 ft				
Free surface flow maintained through bridge for frequencies up to and including the 1 $\%$ AEP (100-year event)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.5.1; **Design Variance**
Bench elevation is above design high water elevation	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.6; Standard Drawing 804-105-00; **Design Variance**
Abandoned road embankments and temporary construction fill is removed and the area graded to the approximate natural ground conditions.	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.9; **Design Variance**
Lifelines and Interstate are operational during the 1 % AEP (100-year event) and 0.2 % AEP (500-year event)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.1
*Tidal - Freeboard is 2 ft above the 10-year design storm plus wave height	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	RHDS 1.1.5.2
Scour				
Scour analysis performed for the 1 % AEP (100-year event) and				
0.2 % AEP (500-year event) storms	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-3

Scour analysis performed using USGS bridge-scour envelope curves, where possible. Preferred alternative when site characteristics are within the limits of the data.	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-3
Scour analysis performed using HEC-18 when USGS bridge- scour curves are not applicable and for comparison purposes. Used with unusual site conditions (pressure flow, overtopping, hydraulically wide piers, and complex piers).	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-3
Min Class B rip-rap for abutment protection is used	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.6; Standard Drawing 804-105-00
Rip-rap thickness 2 x D ₅₀ on end fills	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.6; Standard Drawing 804-105-00
Rip-rap entrenched 2.0 ft below ground line and 2.0 ft above design year storm (or top of bench)	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.6; Standard Drawing 804-105-00
Rip-rap protection provided on all abutment end fills	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-3
Design avoids severe flow contractions	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-3
Bridge sized to minimize velocities and scour potential	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.3
Bridges in Floodplains	-			
There is no increase in the post water surface profiles				
compared to pre conditions. Non-compliance requires FEMA involvement.	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2
Proper model designations used in model with floodplain. The				
model designations are current effective, converted, corrected	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.1
effective, existing conditions, revised conditions, unrestricted	_ i.c.	- 140		1100 2013 4 1.1.2.1
(or natural) conditions, as-build revised conditions.				
Finding of "No Impact" met for SFHAs with floodways. SCDOT				
considers a project to meet the requirements for a				
finding of "No Impact" if there is no increase in the 1% AEP	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.2
flood and floodway profiles and there is no increase in floodway	/			
width at published and unpublished cross sections.				
Finding of "No Impact" met for SFHAs without floodways set				
with limited detail models. SCDOT considers a project to meet	¬\/aa	- Na	-NI/A	UDD 2010 4.1.1.2.2
the requirements for a finding of "No Impact" if there is no	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.2
increase in the 1% AEP flood profile for published and unpublished cross sections.				
Finding of "No Impact" met for an approximate Zone A and				
areas outside of a SFHA. SCDOT considers a project to				
meet the requirements for a finding of "No Impact" when the				
hydraulic design demonstrates 1.0 foot or less of backwater	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.2
above the unrestricted or natural 1% AEP flood profile and			•	
there is no increase in backwater compared to the existing				
conditions profile.				
CLOMR or LOMR prepared for crossing where "No Impact" is	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.3
not achievable Procedures followed for Projects in Special Flood Hazard Areas				
Procedures followed for Projects in Special Flood Hazard Areas with Floodways	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.4
Procedures followed for Projects in Special Flood Hazard Areas	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.5
without Floodways based on Limited Detailed Studies			·	
Procedures followed for Projects in Approximate Zone A Procedures followed for Projects outside of Special Flood	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.6
Procedures followed for Projects outside of Special Flood Hazard Areas	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.2.7
Bridge Sized Culvert (20 ft or greater) Additional Items to Review				
Culvert sized to minimize velocities and scour potential	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.3
Used in areas with low debris potential	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.8
Outlet protection design using HEC-14	□Yes	□ No	□N/A	HDB 2019-4 1.1.8